



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/665,179

09/17/2003

Bradley D. Kolar

33836.03.0004

5569

30498

7590

09/15/2009

Vedder Price PC

222 NORTH LASALLE STREET

CHICAGO, IL 60601

EXAMINER

STERRETT, JONATHAN G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/15/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/665,179	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KOLAR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JONATHAN G. STERRETT	<b>Art Unit</b> 3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8 June 2009 has been entered.

Currently **Claims 1-47** are pending. This **Non-Final Office Action** is responsive to 8 June 2009.

2. The applicants arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

The applicants argue that the amendments have overcome the 101 rejections.

The examiner respectfully disagrees.

The amendments to the claims address the preamble and insignificant pre or post solution activity (i.e. storing data). As noted below, the examiner suggests amending the main steps in the method to be performed by a computer, or using a computer processor in the computer, to perform the steps. If there is one main step in a method claim, then that step should recite a positive tie to a particular machine. Otherwise the claim fails to recite a requisite tie to a particular machine. As noted below, if this is not clear, the applicant may contact the examiner at their convenience.

The applicants argue that the limitations fail to teach “educational product alignment values, for indicating the alignment of each educational product to said business organization’s goals with respect to employee training”. In further support of this argument, the applicant traverses the examiner’s notion that the data is nonfunctional descriptive material.

The examiner respectfully disagrees.

The examiner notes that the cited limitation includes a “for” after “values”. This indicates that the values are being used "for" something. They are being used to indicate alignment with respect to goals. This is an intended use limitation. The applicant is comparing scores against a goal to determine if the goal is met. The cited references teach comparison criteria. This is the same functionality as is provided by the claims, that of using values generated to determine how those values compare, i.e. with goals.

The applicant argues that the cited references fail to teach the use of business goal rules representing a business organization's goals with respect to employee training.

The examiner respectfully disagrees.

In the Office Action mailed on 26 August 2008, the examiner showed how the business goal rules function in the same way to assign scores based on thresholds being met (e.g. both the applicant's specification and Lawlis show using a range, and if

Art Unit: 3623

an evaluation is within a particular range, then a resulting score is given). The mere fact that the “business goal rule data” as argued by the applicants “represents a business organization’s goals with respect to employee training” indicates that the business goal rules are being used in a way that is not patentably distinct – i.e. merely to indicate thresholds in how evaluations are scored. The thresholds and resulting scores represent an organization’s goals with respect to employee training. In this sense the applicant’s invention and Lawlis, as noted previously, work exactly the same way. The use of criteria for setting a threshold for applying scores is the same - the labels of the thresholds, i.e. “business goal” rules, does not distinguish the rules over the prior art because the functionality is the same.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. **Claims 1-30 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.**

Claims 1, 5 and 21 are directed toward the statutory category of a process. In order for a claimed process to be patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101, it must either: (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus), or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. See *In re Bilski*, *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972). If neither

Art Unit: 3623

of these requirements is met by the claim, the method/process is not patentable subject matter under § 101. Thus, to qualify as a statutory process under § 101, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class to which it is tied (e.g. by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps), or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed (e.g. by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state).

Here, the claimed invention does not transform underlying subject matter to a different state or thing because it merely creates and implements a business model and adjusts reward structures based on performance.

The claims recite a computer in the preamble, and recite storing data in a computer's memory, however, the operative steps of the method (operative in the sense that they comprise the main steps, rather than just insignificant post or pre solution activity), fail to positively recite a tie to a particular machine or apparatus.

Thus, the claims are not tied to another statutory category and is not patentable under § 101.

To overcome this rejection, the examiner suggests reciting that these steps are performed by the computer, or by a processor in the computer. Additionally, the applicant can contact the examiner at their convenience and the examiner will explain how to overcome this rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 USC. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1-10, 13-20, 31-33 and 43-46** are rejected under 35 USC. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lawlis**, et al.; "A Formal Process for evaluating COTS Software Products", (C) 2001 IEEE, Computer, pp.58-63 (hereinafter **Lawlis**) in view of Mamoukaris et al.; "Evaluation of web-based educational systems", 2000, Vol. 1, Academy of Business Education, pp.1-6 (hereinafter **Mamoukaris**) and further in view of "Using computers to deliver training: Which employees learn and why?" KG Brown - Personnel Psychology, 2001 - interscience.wiley.com (hereinafter **Brown**).

Regarding **Claim 5**, Lawlis teaches

**An educational product evaluation method comprising:**

Page 58 column 1 para 1,

**storing business goal rule data;**

Page 58 column 1 para 3-4, the RCPEP is a stored evaluation technique for evaluation of COTS software products.

**generating a plurality of educational product alignment values for each of a plurality of educational products, based on a plurality of associated plurality of**

Art Unit: 3623

**educational product evaluation category values and the stored business goal rule data;**

page 60 Figure 2, values for a plurality of products are generated, based on a plurality of categories and the rules for applying those categories to the products.

**generating, for each educational product of interest, an overall business alignment value based on the plurality of educational product alignment values; and**

page 60 Figure 2, the sum total of each of the plurality of scores (i.e. an overall value) based on the single values.

**generating an educational product summary containing at least the overall business alignment value for each of the plurality of educational products.**

Page 60 Figure 2, the product summary scores for products A, B thru Z (bottom of table) is generated for each product.

Lawlis does not teach where the business goal rule data corresponds to a business organization's goals with respect to employee training. However, the recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the specific data. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP ' 2106.



Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art for business organization's to have goals with respect to training.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lawlis to include measuring educational products based on goals that an organization has with respect to training, because it would have provided a predictable result through evaluating software products against an organization's goals for training.

Lawlis teaches the use of numerical metrics to evaluate software, where the software is scored according to scoring rules. Lawlis shows what is known in the art regarding comparing various items against each other through comparing against known standards. Lawlis teaches the use of various criteria for evaluation of a product. However, while Lawlis assigns values to various criteria, Lawlis does not teach where the criteria is used as per:

**Wherein each educational product evaluation category value represents at least one of tuition, duration, participant rating or a priority of course with a content area;**

**Wherein said plurality of educational products includes at least one of an instructor lead face to face course, a self-study course and a virtual course**

Art Unit: 3623

Mamoukaris teaches the use of criteria for comparing if products meet certain standards and desirability aspects:

**Wherein each educational product evaluation category value represents at least one of tuition, duration, participant rating or a priority of course with a content area;**

page 4 chart shows participant rating of evaluation of various tools as to their effectiveness in key educational areas (e.g. platform independence, course restrictions, reports of user's progress).

**Wherein said plurality of educational products includes at least one of an instructor lead face to face course, a self-study course and a virtual course**

Page 3 under section 3, Mamoukaris is evaluating virtual courses.

Lawlis and Mamoukaris both address issues with evaluating software (Lawlis is evaluating general COTS software and Mamoukaris is evaluating aspects of software for distance learning), thus they both are analogous art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Lawlis, where various software aspects are scored and tallied, to include the teachings of Mamoukaris regarding evaluation of software aspects of distance learning tools, because it would have provided a predictable result in using known numerical techniques of scoring to evaluate the software aspects of distance learning tools.

Art Unit: 3623

One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the two references because the substitution of the criteria in Mamoukaris into Lawlis would provide the predictable result of using a known scoring and evaluating technique to show how various software packages related to learning and education are evaluated.

Both Lawlis and Mamoukaris teach comparing something against a target. In Lawlis, there are standards for comparison known in the art of software evaluation against which different software criteria are evaluated. In Mamoukaris, the criteria are evaluated against essentially a 1 or a 0 score – it either has the desired functionality or it does not. However, Lawlis and Mamoukaris do not teach the intended use limitation of where the business goal rule data corresponds to a business organization's goals with respect to employee training. However Brown suggests using a standard scoring approach, such as taught by Lawlis and Mamoukaris, to evaluate employee learning (i.e. business goal rule data corresponds to a business organization's goals). See page 282 under at least knowledge).

Thus one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the advantages of using the result of combining Lawlis and Mamoukaris to include the teachings of Brown such that the scoring approach taught by Lawlis with the educational categories of Mamoukaris would include scoring such that the business goal rule data corresponds to a business organization's goals). The result is a predictable one, that is using the standard scoring approach by Lawlis with Mamoukaris' educational categories provides evaluation along educational category lines. This combination with Brown provides an evaluation of how

Art Unit: 3623

the educational product meets a business organization's goals with respect to employee training.

Thus the combination is obvious because it provides a predictable combination of what is known in the art.

Regarding **Claim 6**, Lawlis teaches

**The method of claim 5 wherein storing the business goal rule data includes storing data representing rules defined for a plurality of desired business goals wherein the business goal rule data represents at least one of: a strategic importance level, a cost effectiveness level and an educational product impact level.**

Figure 2, "Runs on appropriate platform" is a strategic importance level.

Regarding **Claim 7**, Lawlis teaches

**The method of claim 5 including generating the educational product summary to contain the plurality of educational product alignment values corresponding to each of the plurality of educational products.**

Page 60 Figure 2, the summary contains the product alignment values corresponding to each of the products A, B...Z.

Regarding **Claim 8**, Lawlis teaches

**The method of claim 7 including presenting the educational product summary for a user.**

Figures 2 and 4 teach presenting the product summary to a user.

Regarding **Claim 9**, Lawlis teaches

**The method of claim 5 including generating the plurality of educational product alignment values for each of a plurality of educational products based on received weighting values associated with each of the plurality of educational product alignment values.**

Page 60 figure 3, each of the ratings assigned to particular metric (i.e. product alignment values) is based on importance weightings for each of the individual metrics.

Regarding **Claim 10**, Lawlis teaches

**The method of claim 5 wherein generating the plurality of educational product alignment values for each of a plurality of educational products includes generating a strategic importance alignment value, a cost effectiveness alignment value and an educational product impact alignment value.**

Page 60 Figure 2, "runs on appropriate platform", i.e. a strategic importance alignment value; "Supports appropriate configurations", i.e. a cost effectiveness alignment value; and "Online Help Context Sensitive", i.e. an educational product impact value.

Regarding **Claim 13**, Lawlis teaches

**The method of claim 5 wherein storing the business goal rule data includes providing a cost threshold input interface operative to receive cost thresholds for different types of educational products.**

Page 59 column 1 para 1 and 2, the entering of data into a matrix for scoring (i.e. an interface for receiving data).

Regarding **Claim 14**, Lawlis teaches

**The method of claim 5 wherein storing the business goal rule data includes providing an educational product time input interface operative to receive time threshold data for different types of educational products.**

Page 59 column 1 para 1 and 2, the entering of data into a matrix for scoring (i.e. an interface for receiving data).

Regarding **Claim 15**, Lawlis teaches

**The method of claim 10 including generating a cost effectiveness alignment value matrix containing at least description data relating to different cost scores and different corresponding time scores.**

Page 60 column2 – the use of a matrix shows how different scores in different categories (i.e. cost and time) relate to each other.

Regarding **Claim 16**, Lawlis teaches

**The method of claim 7 including generating the education product summary to include corresponding description data for each educational product and for each educational product alignment value for each educational product.**

Page 62 Figure 4, the legend in the chart describes description data (i.e. product names) and illustrates the value for each chart.

Regarding **Claim 17**, Lawlis teaches

**The method of claim 5 including generating an overall business alignment value range graphic element containing sub ranges corresponding to different degrees of alignment with corresponding business goal rule data.**

Figure 4(a), a graphic element with subgroups containing different degrees of alignment with the subrankings.

Regarding **Claim 18**, Lawlis teaches

**The method of claim 5 including generating a graphic element illustrating educational product penetration compared to a group of educational products.**

Figure 4(c), the different products are compared to each other with respect to various criteria.a

Regarding **Claim 19**, Lawlis teaches

**The method of claim 5 including generating an educational product content redundancy map indicating which educational products include subject matter that is pertinent to multiple strategic subject categories.**

Figure 4-c, shows which products include various subject matter rankings, i.e. pertinent to multiple strategic subject categories.

Regarding **Claim 20**, Lawlis teaches

**The method of claim 10 wherein generating the educational product summary includes providing a graphic element representing the educational product summary including visual coding of the strategic importance alignment value, the cost effectiveness alignment value and the educational product impact alignment value.**

Figure 4, the shading of the graph elements provides visual coding of the various categories being ranked.

**Claims 1-4, 31-33 and 43-46** recite similar limitations to those addressed by the rejection of **Claims 5-10 and 13-20**, and are therefore rejected under the same rationale.



Furthermore regarding **Claims 31-33 and 43-46**, Lawlis teaches the limitations recited by the apparatus, however Lawlis does not explicitly teach the method being performed on a computer apparatus with memory and various generators as claimed.

However, Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known to perform method steps, such as taught by Lawlis using a computer. This makes the method steps faster and more efficient, since they are running on a computer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Lawlis, Mamoukaris and Brown to include performing the method steps on a computer, since it would make the performance of these steps faster and more efficient since they are running on a computer.

7. **Claims 11, 12, 21-30, 34-42** are rejected under 35 USC. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lawlis** in view of **Mamoukaris**, in view of **Brown**, in view of **Murphy**, Cheryl; "An evaluation format for "open" software tools", 1995, Computers in Human Behavior, v11, No. 3-4, pp.619-631, (hereinafter **Murphy**) and further in view of Matthew Owen Howard, R Dale Walker, Patricia Silk Walker, Richard T Suchinsky; "Alcohol and drug education in schools of nursing", Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education. Lansing: Spring 1997. Vol. 42, Iss. 3; pg. 54, 27 pgs, (hereinafter **Howard**)

Art Unit: 3623

Regarding **Claim 11**, Lawlis teaches using a composite scoring system to rate a software product using various input values, as discussed above, and Lawlis teaches:

**The method of claim 10 wherein;**  
**the educational product impact alignment value is based on at least**  
**participant rating data and usage data associated with the educational product**

Lawlis further teaches a strategic importance alignment value based on a strategic importance priority level data of an educational content area (see page 60 Figure 3 – adequacy of specific analysis is data of an educational content area).

Lawlis does not teach where the input values are based upon  
**course hours for the educational products associated with the educational**  
**content area**

**the cost effectiveness alignment value is based on at least a number of**  
**hours per educational product and a cost of the educational product; and**

Murphy teaches where the cost of a product as an input factor is important when rating a product (page 624 para 1 under “Cost Effectiveness”).

Murphy teaches on page 1 that considering cost is important when considering a software product for higher education (page 619 para 1). Murphy addresses rating software thus Murphy and Lawlis are analogous art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Lawlis, Mamoukaris and Brown to include rating software based on cost, as taught by Murphy, because it would improve the software rating by taking into account a cost evaluation as an input factor.

Lawlis, Mamoukaris, Brown and Murphy do not teach using course hours associated with the educational content and number of hours per educational product as a rating input.

However, the idea of associating course hours with educational content is old and well known as a rating or measuring input as shown by Howard. Howard teaches the using of course hours associated with educational content as a way to measure the importance of the course in a student's overall curriculum (see page 59 para 2, the amount of time, i.e. course hours, is used to measure the proportion of time spent in teaching. The use of hours to measure the importance of an instructional course provides a predictable result because it is used in comparison to the total number of hours of instruction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Lawlis, Mamoukaris, Brown and Murphy , regarding measuring the cost of an educational software product to include where the

Art Unit: 3623

measurement is based on the a number of hours per educational product and course hours for the educational products associated with the educational content area, because it would include a known way of measuring educational aspects by taking into account the hours spent on those educational aspects and thus provide a predictable result through the application of a known metric known in the art.

Regarding **Claim 12**, Lawlis teaches

**The method of claim 11 including presenting a content area importance table that visually differentiates each strategic importance priority level data for each educational content area.**

Page 60 Figures 2 and 3 visually differentiate the data for each software rating area.

**Claims 21-30 and 34-42** recite similar limitations to those addressed by Lawlis, Mamoukaris, Brown, Murphy and Howard above, and are therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Furthermore regarding **Claims 34-42**, Lawlis, Mamoukaris, Brown, Murphy and Howard teach the limitations recited by the apparatus, however they do not explicitly teach the method being performed on a computer and using software.

However, Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known to perform method steps, such as taught by Lawlis using a computer and software. This makes the method steps faster and more efficient, since they are running on a computer and encoded in a software program.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Lawlis to include performing the limitations on a computer with software, since it would make the performance of these steps faster and more efficient since they are running on a computer.

Furthermore regarding, Lawlis does not explicitly teach a computer interface per se and a display that presents the output information.

However, Official Notice is taken that providing these elements on a computer are old and well known for the purpose of making the interface with the computer easy to use.

It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of Lawlis to include where the performance of his various steps include a display and interface for entering and seeing the result of the data processing, because it would make the interaction with the computer in performing of the method steps easy to use.

Art Unit: 3623

8. **Claim 47** is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lawlis** in view of **Mamoukaris**, in view of **Brown** and further in view of Richard B. Freeman; “Occupational Training in Proprietary Schools and Technical Institutes”, The Review of Economics and Statistics, Vol. 56, No. 3 (Aug., 1974), pp. 310-318. (hereinafter **Freeman**).

Regarding **Claim 47**, Lawlis and Mamoukaris teach collectively providing an evaluation of various aspects of software. Lawlis teaches constraints (i.e. business goal rule data) for evaluating software where those constraints provide evaluation of certain metrics where the evaluation is based on a numerical threshold. Lawlis and Mamoukaris do not teach where the constraints (i.e. the business goal rule data):

**includes at least a course duration limitation limiting the number of days a week an employee can participate in a course given required job related activities.**

Freeman teaches the concept of limiting the number of days a week an employee can participate in a course given required job related activities (see page 312 column 1 para 2, here Freeman discusses the limitation that schools place on courses for those who are working (i.e. given their required job responsibilities). Freeman teaches that this is a quantifiable measure for those who are working and going to school (see footnote on same page). (The examiner notes that Freeman teaches in different hours per week per student, rather than number of days, but Official Notice is

Art Unit: 3623

taken this difference would be recognizable to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention as an obvious variant of the hours per week per student).

It therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Lawlis, Marmoukaris and Brown, regarding using quantifiable metrics to measure educational products, to use a measure of course duration limitation limiting the amount of time that a student can participate in a course as a quantifiable metric, because it would have provided a predictable result in measuring aspects of an educational course.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Model-based performance assessment- ► [ucla.edu](https://ucla.edu) [PDF]

EL Baker - Theory Into Practice, 1997 - [jstor.org](https://www.jstor.org)

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan G. Sterrett whose telephone number is 571-272-6881. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-6.

Art Unit: 3623

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell be reached on 571-272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JGS 9-12-09

/Jonathan G. Sterrett/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623



Application/Control Number: 10/665,179  
Art Unit: 3623

Page 24